

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 10-26 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The Examiner objected to claim 20 for informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13 19-21 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 15-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Watanabe (US Patent 7,034,969). The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 12 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu (US Patent 6,040,923) and Iizuka (US Patent 6,721,009). The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 13-14 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu, Iizuka, and Watanabe. The Examiner rejected claims 20-21 and 25-26 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Watanabe and Iizuka. Applicant amends claims 1, 12, 13, 15-16, 18-20, 22, 23 and 25-26. Claims 1-3 and 10-26 are pending after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 20 for informalities. Applicant amends claim 20, which obviates the Examiner's objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13 19-21 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite, particularly, the Examiner asserts that there is no antecedent basis in the specification for scanning a first portion and a second portion of a document.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and directs the Examiner to Figure 2 and paragraphs [0015]-[0019] of the specification as originally-filed for support for the claim features. For instance, the specification as originally-filed discloses a document that includes N number of scan lines, where after scanning one scan line, the scanner determines whether to scan a next scan line of a document in block 212 of Figure 2. Since the specification as originally-filed discloses the ability to separately scan multiple scan lines a document, the claims are definite. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the instant rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102(b) and §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 15-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Watanabe. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 12 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu and Iizuka. The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 13-14 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu, Iizuka, and Watanabe. The Examiner rejected claims 20-21 and 25-26 under U.S.C. 103(a) over Watanabe and Iizuka.

Claim 1 recites *shielding at least one of the front region or the post region of the optical sensing device from light when scanning the document and the shielding inhibits an overflow of induced charges in the front region when scanning the second portion of the document.*

Nothing in Watanabe, Takashimizu, or Iizuka teaches or suggests the recited shielding. See, Watanabe, col. 10, line 50 – col. 11, line 20, where all sensors in the photodiode array 42 are used during scanning operations and they all output charges to a transfer path 46. See, Takashimizu, col. 8, line 36 – col. 9, line 53, where the CCDs 40-1 and 40-2 scan a paper as it passes a respective reading point and each output an electrical signal of the scanned image. See, Iizuka, col. 7, lines 30 – col. 9, line 14, where all of the receiving elements 2 capture light and store corresponding charges in the vertical registers 3. In other words, there is no disclosure in the cited references of *shielding at least one of the front region or the post region of the optical sensing device from light when scanning the document* as the claim recites.

Applicant further amends claim 1 to clarify that the recited shielding *inhibits an overflow of induced charges in the front region when scanning the second portion of the document.* As discussed above, since there is no disclosure in Watanabe, Takashimizu, or Iizuka of the recited shielding, there is also no disclosure of shielding that *inhibits an overflow of induced charges in the front region when scanning the second portion of the document* as the claim recites. Furthermore, Watanabe, Takashimizu, and Iizuka do not provide any motivation to incorporate the recited shielding into their designs, as none of the references discuss any possibility of incurring the recited overflow of induced charges in the front region. Since none of the references teach or suggest the recited shielding, much less shielding that inhibits an overflow of induced charges in the front region when scanning the second portion of the document, the combination of Watanabe,

Takashimizu, and Iizuka therefore does not teach or suggest claim 1 and its respective dependent claims. Applicant therefore requests the rejection to claim 1, and its corresponding dependent claims, be withdrawn. Since claim 1 includes features generally similar to at least some of the features of claims 19 and 25, the combination of Watanabe, Takashimizu, and Iizuka also does not teach or suggest claims 19 and 25 and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP


Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205

Customer No. 73552